

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 14 through 21, 24 through 27, and 31 through 43 are pending, with Claims 14, 18, 24, 31, and 35 being independent. Claims 14, 17, 18, 21, 24, 27, 31, 34, 35, and 38 have been amended. Claims 39 through 43 have been added.

Claims 14 through 38 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 over European Patent Document 0 938 218 A2 (Niida, et al.), taken alone or in combination with U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0048534 A1 (Tanaka, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 14 and 18 variously recite, *inter alia*, determining whether the reception means receives a command *other* than a response corresponding to the predetermined command prior to a reception of the response, and controlling an issuing timing of a next command in a case where it is determined that the reception means has received the command other than the response prior to a reception of the response.

Claim 24 recites, *inter alia*, determining whether or not a command received from a partner prior to a response corresponding to the predetermined command is a response corresponding to the predetermined command, and changing an issuing timing of a next command in a case where it is determined in the determination step that the command received from the partner prior to a reception of the response is *not* the response corresponding to the predetermined command.

Claims 31 and 35 recite, *inter alia*, determining whether a command *other* than a response corresponding to the predetermined command is received prior to a reception of the response, and controlling an issuing timing of a next command when it is determined that the command other than the response has been received prior to a reception of the response.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Niida, et al. nor Tanaka, et al., even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 14, 18, 24, 31, and 35.

The Official Action relies, *inter alia*, upon Niida, et al.'s [0195]-[0223], which refers, e.g., to use of a response packet of `ack_busy`. However, Applicants respectfully submit that such a busy signal is a response corresponding to a predetermined command and therefore cannot be a command *other* than the response corresponding to a predetermined command as claimed.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Attorney for Applicants
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/cmg

DC_MAIN 261665v1